A U M

To feed a single good man is infinitely greater in point of merit than attending to questions about heaven and earth, spirits and demons, such as occupy ordinary men.
—*Sutra of Forty-two Sections, 10.*

Our deeds, whether good or evil, follow us like shadows.
—*Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king. v. 1629.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. VII **MAY, 1919** **No. 7**

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

OCCULT OR EXACT SCIENCE?*

ECCE *Signum!* Behold the sign foreseen in a brighter future; the problem that will be *the* question of the forthcoming age, that every thoughtful, earnest father will be asking himself with regard to his children's education in the XXth century. And let it be stated at once, that by "Occult Science" neither *the life* of a *chela* nor the austerities of an ascetic are here meant; but simply the study of that which alone can furnish the key to the mysteries of nature, and unveil the problems of the universe and of psycho-physical man—even though one should not feel inclined to go any deeper.

Every new discovery made by modern science vindicates the truths of the archaic philosophy. The true occultist is acquainted with no single problem that esoteric science is unable to solve, if approached in the right direction; the scientific bodies of the West have as yet no phenomenon of natural science that they can fathom to its innermost depths, or explain in all its aspects. Exact science fails to do so—in *this* cycle, for reasons that will be given further on. Nevertheless the pride of the age, which revolts against the intrusion into the empire of science of old—especially of transcendental—truths, is growing every year more intolerant. Soon the world will behold it soaring in the clouds of self-sufficiency like a new tower of Babel, to share, perchance, the fate of the Biblical monument.

In a recent scientific work on Anthropology,[1] one can read the following: "It is then given to us, at last, *to know* (?), to grasp, to handle and measure the forces through which it is claimed, that

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for April, 1886.
[1] *Bulletin de la Société d' Anthropologie,* 3 *fasc.* p. 384.

God proceeded. . . . We have made electricity our postman, light our draughtsman, affinity our journeyman," etc., etc. This is in a French work. One who knows something of the perplexities of exact science, of the mistakes and daily confessions of her staff, feels inclined, after reading such pompous stuff, to exclaim with the malcontent of the Bible: *Tradidit mundum ut non sciant.* Verily —"the word was delivered to them that *they should never know* it."

How likely the scientists are *to succeed* in this direction may be inferred from the fact that the great Humboldt himself could give expression to such erroneous axioms as this one: "Science begins for man only *when his mind has mastered* MATTER!"[1] The word "spirit" for "matter" might perhaps have expressed a greater truth. But M. Renan would not have complimented the venerable author of the *Kosmos* in the terms he did, had the term matter been replaced by spirit.

I intend to give a few illustrations to show that the knowledge of matter alone, with the quondam "imponderable" forces—whatever the adjective may have meant with the French Academy and Royal Society at the time it was invented—is not sufficient for the purposes of true science. Nor will it ever prove efficient to explain the simplest phenomenon even in objective physical nature, let alone the abnormal cases in which physiologists and biologists at present manifest such interest. As Father Secchi, the famous Roman astronomer expressed it in his work,* "If but a few of the *new* forces were proven, they would necessitate the admission in their domain (that of forces) of agents of *quite another order* than those of gravitation."

"I have read a good deal about occultism and studied Kabbalistic books: I have never understood one word in them!"—was a recent remark made by a learned experimenter in "thought-transference," "colour-sounds," and so on.

Very likely. One has to study his letters before he can spell and read, or understand what he reads.

Some forty years back, I knew a child—a little girl of seven or eight—who very seriously frightened her parents by saying:

"Now, mama, I love you. You are good and kind to me to-day. Your words *are quite blue*" . . .

"What do you mean?" . . . asked the mother.

"Your words are all blue—because they are so caressing, but when you scold me *they are red* . . . so red! But it is worse when you fly in a passion with papa for then they are orange . . . horrid . . . like that" . . .

And the child pointed to the hearth, with a big roaring fire and huge flames in it. The mother turned pale.

After that the little sensitive was heard very often associating sounds with colours. The melody played by the mother on the piano threw her into ecstacies of delight; she saw "such beautiful

[1] *Kosmos*, Vol. I, pp. 3 and 76 (with same ideas).
* *Delle Forze*, etc.

rainbows," she explained, but when her aunt played, it was "fire-works and stars," brilliant stars *shooting pistols*—and then . . . bursting" . . .

The parents got frightened and suspected something had gone wrong with the child's brain. The family physician was sent for.

"Exuberance of childish fancy," he said. "Innocent hallucinations . . . Don't let her drink tea, and make her play more with her little brothers—fight with them, and have physical exercise. . . . "

And he departed.

In a large Russian city, on the banks of the Volga, stands an hospital with a lunatic asylum attached to it. There a poor woman was locked up for over twenty years—to the day of her death in fact—as a "harmless" though *insane* patient. No other proofs of her insanity could be found on the case-books than the fact that the splash and murmur of the river-waves produced the finest "God's rainbows" for her; while the voice of the superintendent caused her to see "black and crimson"—the *colours of the Evil one.*

About that same period, namely in 1840, something similar to this phenomenon was heralded by the French papers. Such an abnormal state of feelings—physicians thought in those days—could be due but to one reason; such *impressions* whenever experienced without any *traceable* cause, denoted an ill-balanced mind, a weak brain—likely to lead its possessor to lunacy. Such was *the decree* of science. The views of the piously inclined, supported by the affirmations of the village *curés,* inclined the other way. The brain had nought to do with the "obsession," for it was simply the work or tricks of the much slandered "old gentleman" with cloven foot and shining horns. Both the men of learning and the superstitious "good women" have had somewhat to alter their opinions since 1840.

Even in that early period and before the "Rochester" wave of spiritualism had swept over any considerable portion of civilized society in Europe, it was shown that the same phenomenon could be produced by means of various narcotics and drugs. Some bolder people, who feared neither a charge of lunacy nor the unpleasant prospect of being regarded as wards in "Old Nick's Chancery," made experiments and declared the results publicly. One was Théophile Gautier, the famous French author.

Few are those acquainted with the French literature of that day, who have not read the charming story told by that author, in which he describes the dreams of an opium-eater. To analyze the *impressions* at first hand, he took a large dose of *hashisch.* "My hearing," he writes, "acquired marvellous capacities: *I heard the music of the flowers;* sounds,—green, red and blue—poured into my ears in clearly *perceptible* waves of *smell* and *colour.* A tumbler upset, the creaking of an arm-chair, a word whispered in the lowest tones vibrated and resounded *within me* like so many claps of thunder. At the gentlest contact with objects—furniture or human

body—I heard prolonged sounds, sighs like the melodious vibrations of an Æolian harp . . . "†

No doubt the powers of human fancy are great; no doubt delusion and hallucination may be generated for a shorter or a longer period in the healthiest human brain either naturally or artificially. But natural phenomena that are not included in that "abnormal" class do exist; and they have at last taken forcible possession even of scientific minds. The phenomena of hypnotism, of thought- transference, of sense-provoking, merging as they do into one another and manifesting their occult existence in our phenomenal world, succeeded finally in arresting the attention of some eminent scientists. Under the leadership of the famous Dr. Charcot, of the Salpêtriere Hospital in Paris, several famous men of science took the phenomena in hand—in France, Russia, England, Germany and Italy. For over fifteen years they have been experimenting, investigating, theorising. And what is the result? The sole explanation given to the public, to those who thirst to become acquainted with the real, the intimate nature of the phenomena, with their productive cause and genesis—is that the sensitives who manifest them are all HYSTERICAL! They are *psychopates,** and *neurosists*[1]—we are told,—no other cause underlying the endless variety of manifestations than that of a purely physiological character.

This looks satisfactory for the present, and—quite hopeful for the future.

"Hysterical hallucination" is thus doomed to become, as it appears, the *alpha* and the *omega* of every phenomenon. At the same time science defines the word "hallucination" as "an error of our *senses,* shared by, and imposed (by that error) upon our *intelligence.*"[2] Now such *hallucinations* of a sensitive as are objective—the apparition of an "astral body" for instance,—are not only perceptible by the sensitive's (or medium's) *"intelligence,"* but are likewise shared by the senses of those present. Consequently the natural inference is that all those witnesses are also *hysterical.*

The world is in danger, we see, of being turned, by the end of this century, into one vast lunatic asylum, in which the learned physicians alone would form the *sane* portion of humanity.

Of all the problems of medical philosophy, hallucination seems, at this rate, the most difficult to solve, the most obstinate to get rid of. It could hardly be otherwise, for it is one of the mysterious results of our dual nature, the bridge thrown over the chasm that separates the world of matter from the world of spirit. None but those willing to cross to the other side can appreciate it, or ever recognize the *noumenon* of its phenomena. And without doubt a manifestation is quite disconcerting to any one who witnesses it for the first time. Proving to the materialist the creative faculty, the *potency* of man's spirit, *naturalising* before the churchman the

† *La Presse,* July 10, 1840.
* A Greek compound term coined by the Russian Medical Faculties.
[1] From the word *neurosis.*
[2] *Dictionnaire Medical.*

"miracle," and *supernaturalising,* so to say, the simplest effects of natural causes, *hallucination* cannot be accepted yet for what it really is, and could hardly be forced upon the acceptation of either the materialist or the believing Christian, since one is as strong in his denial as the other is in his affirmation. "Hallucination," says an authority quoted by Brierre de Boismont,[1] "is the reproduction of the material sign of the idea." Hallucination, it is said, has no respect for age or for merit; or, if a fatal experience is worth anything—"a physician who would give it too much of his attention or would study it for too long a time and *too seriously,* would be sure to end his career in the ranks of his own patients."

This is an additional proof, that "hallucination" was hardly ever studied "too *seriously*" as self-sacrifice is not quite the most prominent feature of the age. But *if* so catching, why should we not be permitted the bold and disrespectful suggestion that the biologists and physiologists of Dr. Charcot's school, have themselves become *hallucinated* with the rather one-sided scientific idea that such phenomenal hallucinations are all due to *Hysteria?*

However it may be, whether a *collective hallucination* of our medical lights or the impotency of material thought, the simplest phenomenon—of the class *accepted* and verified by men of science in the year 1885—remains as unexplained by them, as it was in 1840.

If, admitting for argument sake, that some of the common herd out of their great reverence—often amounting to *fetich worship*—for science and authority, do accept the dictum of the scientists that every phenomenon, every "abnormal" manifestation, is due to the pranks of *epileptic hysteria,* what shall the rest of the public do? Shall they believe that Mr. Eglinton's *self-moving* slate pencil is also labouring under a fit of the same epilepsy as its medium—even though he *does not touch it?* Or that the prophetic utterances of the seers, the grand inspired apostles of all ages and religions, were simply the pathological results of hysteria? Or again that the "miracles" of the Bible, those of Pythagoras, Apollonius and others —belong to the same family of *abnormal* manifestations, as the hallucinations of Dr. Charcot's Mlle. *Alphonsine*—or whatever her name—and her erotic descriptions and her poetry—"in consequence *of the swelling with gases of her great bowel*" (*sic*)? Such a pretension is likely to come to grief. First of all "hallucination" itself, when it is really the effect of physiological cause, would have to be explained—but *it never has been.* Taking at random some out of the hundreds of definitions by eminent French physicians (we have not those of the English at hand) what do we learn about "hallucinations?" We have given Dr. Brierre de Boismont's "definition," if it can be called one: now let us see a few more.

Dr. Lelut calls it—"a *sensorial* and *perceptive* folly;" Dr. Chomil—"a common illusion of the *sensorium;*"* Dr. Leuret—"an illu-

[1] *Hallucination,* p. 3.

* See *Dictionary of Medical Terms.*

sion intermediary between sensation and conception" (*Psychol. Fragments*); Dr. Michéa—"a perceptive delirium" (*Delusion of the Senses*); Dr. Calmeil—"an illusion due to a vicious modification of the nervous substance" (*of Folly*, Vol. I); etc., etc.

The above will not make the world, I am afraid, much wiser than it is. For my part, I believe the theosophists would do well to keep to the old definition of hallucinations (*théophania*)[1] and folly, made some two thousands of years back by Plato, Virgilius, Hippocrates, Galen and the medical and theological schools of old. "There are two kinds of folly, one of which is produced by the body, the other sent to us *by the gods.*"

(*To be continued.*)

THE WITNESS*

Shankara's Vivekachudamani: The Crest Jewel of Wisdom.—201-297.

THE MANIFEST AND THE HIDDEN SELF.

(Concluded from April.)

AS dream-built lands and times, objects and knowers of them, are all unreal, just so here in waking is this world; its cause is ignorance of the Self; in as much as all this world, body and organs, vital breath and personality are all unreal, in so much THOU ART THAT, the restful, the stainless, secondless Eternal, the supreme.

Far away from birth and conduct, family and tribe, quite free from name and form and quality and fault; beyond space and time and objects,—this is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

The supreme, that no word can reach, but that is reached by the eye of awakening, pure of stain, the pure reality of consciousness and mind together,—this is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

Untouched by the six infirmities, reached in the heart of those that seek for union, reached not by the organs, whose being neither intellect nor reason knows,—this is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

Built of error is the world; in That it rests; That rests in itself, different from the existent and the non-existent; partless, nor bound by casuality, is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

Birth and growth, decline and loss, sickness and death it is free from, and unfading; the cause of emanation, preservation, destruction, is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self. [260]

Where all difference is cast aside, all distinction is cast away, a waveless ocean, motionless; ever free, with undivided form,—this is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

---

[1] Communication with Gods.

*This article was printed by Wm. Q. Judge in the *Oriental Department* papers, March-April, 1896.

Being one, though cause of many, the cause of others, with no cause itself; where cause and caused are merged in one, self-being, the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

Free from doubt and change, great, unchanging; where changing and unchanging are merged in one, Supreme; eternal, unfading joy, unstained,—this is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

This shines forth manifold through error, through being the Self under name and form and quality and change; like gold itself unchanging ever,—this is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

This shines out unchanging, higher than the highest, the hidden one essence, whose character is selfhood, reality, consciousness, joy, endless, unfading,—this is the Eternal, THAT THOU ART; become it in the Self.

Let a man make it his own in the Self,—like a word that is spoken, by reasoning from the known, by thought; this is as devoid of doubt as water in the hand, so certain will its reality become.

Recognizing this perfectly illumined one, whose reality is altogether pure, as *one recognizes* the leader of men in the assembled army, and resting on that, always standing firm in one's own Self, sink all this world that is born, into the Eternal.

In the soul, in the hidden place, marked neither as what is nor what is not, is the Eternal, true, supreme, secondless. He who through the Self dwells here in the secret place, for him there is no coming forth again to the world of form.

When the thing is well known even, this beginningless mode of thought, "I am the doer and the enjoyer," is very powerful; this mode of mind lasting strongly, is the cause of birth and rebirth. A looking backward toward the Self, a dwelling on it, is to be effortfully gained; freedom here on earth, say the saints, is the thinning away of that mode of thought.

That thought of "I" and "mine" in the flesh, the eye and the rest, that are not the Self,—this transference *from the real to the unreal* is to be cast away by the wise man by steadfastness in his own Self. [270]

FROM THE SECRET DOCTRINE*

Occultism teaches that no form can be given to anything, either by nature or by man, whose ideal type does not already exist on the subjective plane. More than this; that no such form or shape can possibly enter man's consciousness, or evolve in his imagination, which does not exist in prototype, at least as an approximation.

---

* From the Original Edition, Vol. I, p. 282 (Footnote); see Vol. I, p. 303, Third Edition.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

At the meetings of the United Lodge of Theosophists a part of the time is devoted to Question and Answer. The questions and answers that follow were taken stenographically while "The Ocean of Theosophy," by Wm. Q. Judge, was being studied.

It should be remembered that while the answers are given from the standpoint of many years' experience and application, they are not to be taken as hard and fast definitions, nor as authoritative; but may be used as explanations and applications of the philosophy of Theosophy as related to the particular phases presented in the various questions. Each student, being "the final authority" for himself, should not accept any statement by any being whatever unless he himself perceives its truth.

Beginning with Chapter I of the "Ocean," the succeeding chapters will be taken up seriatim.

CHAPTER IX.

Q. On page 71 is stated, that as we progress in this life, so also must we progress on leaving it, and it would be unfair to compel the others to await our arrival in order that we may recognize them. It seems there is progress after death, more so in fact than during life in the body?

A. The context on that page shows that the Teacher is replying to objections of those who expect to recognize their friends who have gone before by their physical appearance and general characteristics, an expectation which is really based upon a stoppage of progress. It is also shown that the Real Man who passes from existence in a body into other states and returns again from time to time, is really blending his experiences of any one state with his experiences in other states and consequently is making progress after death much more rapidly than bodily conditions could possibly permit. The degree and kind of progress made depends upon the nature of his thinking during life, and may be small or great in one direction or another. Technically speaking, Lower-Manas is the reservoir of the life-thoughts and feelings. Those that are assimilable with Higher Manas are absorbed and become an addition to Higher Manas; while those that are of the nature of earth, earthy, remain as tendencies to be met, and either intensified or transmuted during the succeeding incarnation. The progress referred to is that of *the Higher Ego;* the personality and earth-life is the field wherein the Ego works; after death, the harvest being garnered, the wheat is separated from the chaff.

Q. Then there would be no sowing during the after-death states?

A. The harvest was sown during the earth life last past; during the life time there was a reaping all the time of causes sown in a previous life, and during the life being lived; at death, the sum total of all the thoughts, feelings, desires and tendencies held during

life remain as the basis or cause for the subjective kama-locic and devachanic states; the effects of these are then worked out subjectively, these "effects" of the earth-life becoming then the "cause" of the "effects" experienced subjectively in the after-death states. Sowing and reaping in the field of objective existence provides the "seed" for the subjective after-death states, karma operating continuously in all states.

Q. Then different individuals would have different after-death states, and have each one his own period between incarnations?

A. It could not be otherwise; for just as each one's personal existence in a body differs from every other—is peculiarly his very own in fact—so the after-death states differ in exact accord with the life as lived in a body. Some live their lives with much of good and little of evil; others with much of evil and little of good, each one bringing about his own proportion of these; it is the proportion in each case which determines the period between incarnations. We must remember in considering these matters, that time and space are not the same subjectively as they are with us in bodies; our days and nights, months, years and duration of physical existence are governed by the revolutions of our planet, but in the case of removal from such conceptions of *time,* ideas of that and of space differ greatly on the subjective plane of being. When we are happy, time passes without notice; when we are miserable, time drags; in both cases the hours of our mortal time may be the same, but the sense of the procession of events before our consciousness will make the hours seem fast or slow according to the state we are in. If we are able while in bodies to realize such a conception of time while there is everything about us to remind us of terrestrial time, we should be able to comprehend something of a state where such reminders are entirely absent.

Q. Will a person in his next incarnation express what he has assimilated?

A. No one can express what he has not assimilated; that is,—has made a basis for action. But the question should be amended so as to read "Individual" instead of "Person". The "personality" is in any one life but a temporary aspect and action of the Individuality, and differs in each life, in the environment and in such changes as have been brought about in previous existences—in character, disposition and understanding; these may produce in the next incarnation a change of social relation, mental capacity, nature of body, physical environment, and even of sex. The Personality does not re-incarnate; the Individuality at each re-birth projects a new personality, the qualities and tendencies of which are drawn from the sum-total of all past lives—not only the last one. All the past experience is within and behind each personality and can be reached and realized, yet may remain entirely latent or partially so, according to a more or less intensive conception of personality as a thing in itself, and of physical existence as the only reality.

Q. If the physical life and experience controls the after-death states, it would seem as though the higher planes were controlled by life on the physical plane?

A. They would be so controlled, if the after-death states could be called "higher planes", but as the after-death states of Kama-Loka and Devachan are the *effects* of the life last lived, and are both *personal* in experience, they cannot properly be called *higher planes.* Kama-Loka and Devachan represent respectively the "low" and the "high" subjective *states* of the life last lived *as a person.* The *higher planes* of being pertain to the triad of Atma-Buddhi-Manas, the real Individuality, who, as the immortal being, possesses all the knowledge gained through all past existences.

Q. In the case of a nation that engages in war thus encouraging the lower instincts, would it not draw into incarnation lower egos?

A. In the case of each ego in a body, the results will depend upon *the motive* which actuated *him* in engaging in war or in any other direction. A nation is composed of individual units, the nature of the action in any given case depending upon the ruling motive of the individual. If the motives of the units engaged in war were for justice and freedom, regardless of the necessary war-like acts, then when the objects were obtained and peace resumed, those units would still be actuated by the same motives and would draw egos of like nature. The condition of war may equally provide greater opportunities for self-sacrificing righteous action, and for selfish license and debasement; which it shall be depends upon the nature and choice *of the unit.* A nation has no existence apart from the units which compose it. A selfish peace will result in greater perversions than any number of wars waged for righteous purposes; selfishness lies at the root of all sin, sorrow and suffering.

Q. What difference does it make what kind of a family an ego is drawn into; it might as well have its experience in one way as well as another?

A. The question implies a denial of individual karma, and in fact karma of any sort; it leaves out of consideration the fact of the needs of the Soul by way of discipline and experience. The entrance into birth of an ego, together with the conditions connected with that birth, are pre-determined by the individual merit or demerit of previous lives. The ego cannot enter birth until such conditions as meet its needs are present. Law rules in all such matters, or nothing could be predicated as a resultant of any course of thought and action.

Q. The ego might in some cases have a very long time to wait, might he not?

A. Time with the ego is not what it is with our limitation of conceptions; he is self-conscious and active on higher planes, and "time" as we know it does not affect him as ego; it is only when the culmination of conditions which he while in a body helped to

produce is consummated, that he is unavoidably drawn back to rebirth. Rebirth is due to our unremedied defects, not to our virtues.

Q. Is there any place in nature in which there is a ruling law of Heredity?

A. Heredity prevails on all planes of being; we inherit the resultants of our activities on all planes. We may know our earthly pedigree, but who of us has ever traced all the links of heredity, astral, psychic and spiritual, which go to make us what we in reality are? The Secret Doctrine speaks of three general lines of heredity, the Spiritual, the Intellectual, and the Physical, and says that these three are intermixed and interblended at every point.

Q. The trend of the Gita is in the direction of freedom from rebirth. Is not a righteous and happy existence in a body the chief end of Man?

A. That would imply that the whole trend of evolution was towards a *material* existence, whereas all the facts point in the direction that the Real Man is in essence Spiritual, and has in the immensity of his past accumulated vast stores of knowledge, by means of which He has contacted and is working with, what is generally called Matter, but which in reality is the intelligence and embodiment of entities of a much lower kind. His object is not to seek and make permanent a perfect physical embodiment for Himself, but by his contact and use of these lower lives to gradually give *them* the impulse towards self-consciousness, which alone can arouse to action the latent spirituality in all these lower intelligences. The word Spirituality does not mean a hazy, indefinite condition, as many regard it, but "an intimate *knowledge* of the ultimate essence of everything in Nature". The Real Man—the Triad of Atma-Buddhi-Manas—has therefore descended into "matter"—to use a much misunderstood term—in order to contact, understand it as the embodiment and expression of the innumerable intelligences of which it is composed, and give these lives impulse and direction towards self-consciousness. That He has failed to carry out—as He might have done—the initial self-sacrificing purpose, is due to the illusions pertaining to sentient existence, in which He has become involved by setting up causes which inevitably under karma keep Him fluctuating between Birth, Death, Kama-Loka and Devachan in a continuing series. The freedom from rebirth of which the Gita speaks, is obtained by setting up causes born from an understanding of Man's real nature and mission, and action on the basis of that understanding *while in a body*. Once the chain of lower causation is broken by Him, He is free to choose, and moreover has brought into play on all planes the sum-total of his knowledge. From then on, His field is the whole of Nature, visible and invisible; He will then live a conscious existence in *Spirit*, not in Matter, and can, while occupying bodies of temporary duration, maintain and use His spiritual self-consciousness, knowledge and

power on that plane of existence, without detriment or hindrance. Such are the results of "freedom from re-birth"; instead of loss, as so many imagine, it means immeasurable gain; the goal is worthy of all effort.

Q. How can we in our ignorance make that effort?

A. The Masters of Wisdom have supplied us with the necessary means. Ignorance is destroyed only by Knowledge. Ignorance is composed of false conceptions, and actions on the basis of false conceptions can only lead to more ignorance and its results in sin, sorrow and suffering. The Theosophical Philosophy, as given by Those who brought it, must be learned, studied and applied in all our relations with our fellow-men; this must be done by each of us, no one can do it for us. This implies that our predilections and prejudices acquired from an adoption of the ordinary views of life must be given up, and the basis of thought and action that the Philosophy indicates must take their place. The Devotional books, such as the Gita and the Voice should be constantly read and meditated upon, for they tend to arouse spiritual perceptions. With the means supplied, and an effort to act for and as the Self of all, channels will be opened up within ourselves that will lead to Inner knowledge. As the Master said, "All Nature is before you; take what you can"

SOCRATES TEACHES A CHILD*

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

He drew me very close upon his shoulder. "Do you not always know what is right? Think carefully, little one; do you not always know?"

I pondered a long while. "Yes," I answered, "I do know, when I stop to remember; but how do I know?"

"You have said it. You remember."

"But when did I learn?" I cried, in astonishment.

He paused, holding me out at arm's length and looking in my face. "It is hard to explain," he said. "It is almost too hard for a child to understand; it is often too hard for grown men. But I will do what I can to make it plain to you."

We were now between the Long Walls, and the low sun cast before us far-streaming shadows and tinted the battlements of the distant city.

"Do you see those walls?" he said. "They stretch far; but you saw that they had a beginning, and you know that they have an end. For all things that have a beginning have an end. But that which has no beginning can have no end. Can you think otherwise?"

"But is there anything like that?" I cried.

---

*This dialogue is an extract from "Gorgo", by Charles Kelsey Gaines, (Lothrop Publishing Company.) The book as a whole is one of the few notable and satisfactory reincarnation stories in print. The title given to the extract is ours.

"You know the meaning of what men call 'time,'" he said. "Can you think that it had any beginning? or that it will ever have an end?"

"No; it goes on always. But time—it isn't anything at all," I persisted.

"Well," he said, "you, at least, are something; for you can think and know. But can you remember when first you began to be?"

"No; I cannot remember."

"Perhaps, then, there is something within you that had no beginning. And if that is so, it has had plenty of time to learn. Some think," he said, "that what we call learning is really only remembering. Already you have much to remember, little son of Hagnon."

"Yes," I cried, harking back, "and if it had no beginning it hasn't any end either; for you said so. My mother thought that; but she did not explain as you do."

"And if there is something within us that was not born and can never die, but is like time itself, can this be anything else than that part of us which thinks and knows, which men call the soul?"

"It must be that," I said; for they put the rest in the ground or burn it up. I never understood about the soul before."

"And now," said he, "which part do you think is best worth caring for,—that part which we cast away like a useless garment when it is torn by violence or grows old and worn, or that part which lives always?"

"It is foolish to ask me that; of course it is the part that doesn't die," I answered.

"I am glad," said he, "that you think this a foolish question. Yet there are many who do not understand even this; for just as some care only for clothes, some care only for their bodies. And that, perhaps, is why people do not remember all at once, but very slowly and not clearly, just as one would see things through a thick veil, such as the women sometimes wear before men. It is only when this veil, which is our flesh, is woven very light and fine, or when it has grown old and is worn very thin, that we can see anything through it plainly; and even then all that we see looks misty and does not seem real".

"Yes, but the women can peep over," I explained.

"And we, too, doubtless, can peep over sometimes," he answered, smiling. "It is better then, as you think, and I certainly think so, to seek the things that are good for the soul, which is your very self, than to seek what seems good to the body, which we keep only for a little while."

"And that is why you wear no shoes!" I cried.

"What need have I of shoes?" he said.

Again I pondered. "What are the things that are good for the soul?" I asked him.

"There is but one thing that is good for the soul," he said. "Men call it virtue. But it is only always doing what is right."

There was a long silence after that. At last I spoke again. "But the gods," I said—"they do not die at all. And men die; at least, a part of them dies. And I do not understand about those things that have no beginning and do not come to any end. I never saw anything like that. Tell me more about that."

He set me down in the ruddy twilight and drew a little circle in the dust. "What is that?" he asked me.

"It is the letter the Syracusan called O," I said. "And it really has no beginning and no end," I cried, clapping my hands. "I remember now. And are our souls like that?"

"I sometimes think so," he said.

"But the gods—what are they like? and why do they not die, like men?"

He looked about and picked up a dart that had fallen from a wagon. This he took by the end, and swinging on his heel traced with the point a larger circle, wide around the little one. Then he measured a handbreadth on each. "See," he said, "on the little circle even this short path is much bent, while on the larger it is almost straight."

"Yes," I cried, breathlessly; for it seemed wonderful, all the things that he knew.

"And if the circle were larger yet, the line that makes it what it is would be still straighter."

"Yes," I answered again.

"And if it were made as great as the universe, which the gods alone can compass even in thought, then its path would be altogether straight in every part, running on forever and never swerving or turning back, like the flight of time. Such is the life of the immortals; but the lives of men move in little circles."

I drew a long breath, but made no answer. For this was greater than all that my mother had told me of. I could not even question him further, though all was vague and dim within me. Again he lifted me up and went on; and when we had gone a long way, and it was now quite dark, hugging his neck more closely, "Tell me who you are," I said.

"You heard them speak my name," he answered. "And it may be that you have heard before of a certain Socrates, about whom some say foolish things. But what they say is not true,—neither that I am very wise nor that I am more foolish than others."

"No," I answered, "I never heard anything about you till to-day. I did not mean what is your name, but what is it that you do."

"I try to find out about the truth," he said.

"And is that all you do?"

"I try always to do what I think is right. Nothing else—unless it be something else to go about asking questions. I know that

many dislike me, because I show them that they are believing lies and telling lies to others; but I know also that the gods have commanded me to live just as I do."

"The gods—those gods—they speak to you, Socrates?" I asked, with a greater awe than I had ever known.

"They speak to me," he repeated, bowing his head so that his cheek touched mine, "and I have never willingly disobeyed that voice, nor ever shall. It would come to others if they would listen."

"It is so strange," I said, presently, "that you are not beautiful, like Alcibiades. Perhaps it is only your clothes. My father is rich, and he shall give you clothes and money."

"I have no use for thy father's money, son of Hagnon," he answered, sharply. And then he spoke softly, as if he were sorry for that one little harshness. "I take money from no one; yet the thought in your heart was kind, and for that I thank you. But perhaps I am richer than you suppose—richer even than your father. For he, I think, wants many things, and I want nothing."

"Do you mean," I asked, "that those are the richest who do not need anything?"

"Yes, that is exactly what I mean," he answered. "And as to my not taking money—not to speak of any other reasons now, though there *are* other reasons—it does not seem to me to be right for one who is richer to take from those who are poorer."

I pondered over this; for to me these were new ideas, and I had never seen anybody, unless it were my mother, who did not seem to care for money. Even those who gave it away in great purses, like my father, and those who flung it about and pretended not to care, like Alcibiades, did care and set great store by it; that I saw clearly enough. But this man did not care for it at all. Then my thoughts went back to those still stranger things that he had said about the soul. That was the reason of his not caring,—he cared only for the soul, because that was the only thing that lasted. All the rest was to him like the things that one leaves for the slaves to use.

(To be continued.)

SECRET DOCTRINE TEACHINGS*

Everything in the Universe follows analogy. "As above, so below;" Man is the microcosm of the Universe. That which takes place on the spiritual plane repeats itself on the Cosmic plane. Concretion follows the lines of abstraction; corresponding to the highest must be the lowest; the material to the spiritual.

* From the Original Edition, Vol. I, p. 177; see Vol. I, p. 200, Third Edition.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

RATIONALE OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PRACTICES

Q. It is said that Christian Scientists effect their alleged cures by adopting certain modes of thought. In what way would their "modes" affect the bodily functions so as to bring about changes?

A. Plato said "Ideas rule the world"; this does not mean that *the same ideas* rule every individual, but that ideas of various kinds rule individuals. The modes of life invariably follow the modes of thought held. As modes of thought are changed, modes of life change in accordance therewith; this is self-evident.

If ideas rule individuals in their actions towards others, they must also rule in the uses the body and bodily functions are put to; for the body being the instrument by means of which actions are performed becomes habituated to the qualities of the ideas held and expresses them in their several degrees according to the particular function or functions in action. If this were not so, there could not be brought about any concordance between thought and action.

The body itself, being composed of elements drawn from the three kingdoms of physical nature is in a perpetual state of change; the old elements are thrown off and the new elements take their place, subject to the prevailing habitude of those remaining, the latter being maintained in that habitude by the prevailing ideas held by the individual. When new ideas are adopted and held, a gradual change takes place in the constituent "lives" of the body, until at length all the "lives" are in accord with the established ideas. The mere "idea" itself has no power to effect changes; it is the *feeling* or conviction of the individual holding the idea that makes the idea effective; for "feeling" gives direction to the force of the conscious being, and also qualifies that force according to the nature of the feeling.

In every human being during the long course of evolution from the "formless" through primordial substance to the present physical state of substance, there have been steps or stages of concretion; each step has brought about what might be called a differentiation of force suited to the application of the original spiritual force to that particular step or stage of substance. The force or power in use on every stage of being is qualified and limited to the thought and understanding of the being in regard to the plane upon which he is acting. There is therefore set up a particularly constructed "transformer" of spiritual force at each stage of concretion.

The ordinary human being, by reason of his ignorance of the real nature of Man, draws upon (or through) the "transformer" of spiritual force peculiar to the physical plane, and is therefore limited to the range of energy that particular "transformer" will transmit.

All these "transformers"—seven of them—represent the human principles in general and particular; these are Atma-Buddhi-Manas—or the One Spirit animating all; the acquired wisdom or Divine Soul; and the idealizing, and creative, preservative, and destructive or regenerative faculties, which three constitute the Real Man. The exoteric four *transitory* principles are Lower-Manas-Kama, or Kama-Manas, that is, the Mind controlled by personal and physical desires; Prana, that aspect of the One Spirit-Life which animates the body during physical existence; the Astral body, a design body of substance finer than the physical and the seat of the senses, as well as the container of the real organs of Man; and the Body, composed of physical elements or "lives". All men have these seven principles, but one or more of these principles are active, according to the "ideas" held by the occupant of the body; in most, the higher principles are latent during waking life.

Thus one who lives for physical existence alone, will draw his kind of energy from the Astral "transformer", which of necessity will be limited to physical expressions; another whose ideas are concerned with art, literature, science, religion as related to physical life only, will draw on the Lower-Manasic "transformer", and can use only those forces or powers which that particular "transformer" will transmit; whereas those whose ideas are centered in and based upon the Real Nature of Man draw upon the higher and more spiritual "transformers", all depending upon the partial or complete realization of that higher nature.

Considering, then, that all human beings have these different degrees of power, we may examine the Christian Science "idea" to find the particular principle or "transformer" which brings about their alleged cures. As they show no evidence whatever of a knowledge of the Real Spiritual nature of Man, and apply their idea wholly to personal and physical existence, it is quite plain that the "transformer" in use by them is the Kama-Manasic one, that is, Mind ruled by desires physical and personal. They speak of "Divine Mind" and "Mortal Mind," but it is beyond question that what they say of "Divine Mind" is a lucubration of "Mortal Mind", for that is what they are using. In their idea, the denial of the "mortal" and the affirmation of the "Divine" (qualified by their Christian predilections) is all-sufficient, notwithstanding the patent fact that each of them has a different idea as to what constitutes "Divine" or divinity. It can be seen then that they are drawing upon the Lower Mind both for their ideas of the "Divine" and for such powers as they use.

No question will exist in the mind of thinking men in regard to the effect of idea or thought upon the body; a consideration of the bodily results of the various emotions based upon thoughts of joy, grief, fear, anxiety and so forth, will convince anyone of the fact; the degree of effect, of course, corresponding to the intensity and continuance of the emotion. The consciousness is involved to the

extent that the particular emotion is *dwelt upon* to the exclusion of other considerations. If one held to an idea which overshadowed all such temporary emotions, their effect upon the person would be very small, and possibly none at all. The nature of the idea will make no difference, so long as it overshadows everything else in importance in the mind of the person.

If we now take the Christian Science idea of "Divine Mind", we have what is practically an abstraction; for such definitions as have been attempted consist of statements of the *opposites* of evil and imperfection, and each individual is found to differ in his conceptions of these. The point of all this is, that if an individual holds an abstract conception, his attention is taken off bodily conditions, the tendency to equilibrium in the body is not interfered with, and normal inter-relation in the physical functions may become restored. Many so-called cures are due to this one fact. It has been truly said that two-thirds at least of our ills are due to our "imaginings", and it has been observed that when an individual has a disease, or thinks he has, the tendency is to keep thinking about it, its progress and probable results, thereby intensifying and even creating it by his thoughts.

But there are other and more subtle forces aroused by abstract thinking. By continuing in the way taught, a person actually from the first arouses latent currents of the body that act and re-act on the astral and physical, and at last bring about injury. It is a sort of yoga without any right knowledge of method; it is a blind wandering among forces of the inner man, so subtle and so violent that they are liable to destroy at any moment. Occasionally a wonderful cure is reported, but these things are not followed up scientifically, and subsequent results are not published, any more than are the great number of failures to "cure".

The Christian Science idea has nothing to do with the "cures" made in its name, except to act as a center for the thought, so that inner currents may come into play. The same results might be brought about by any system of talk or thought, no matter how erroneous.

SECRET DOCTRINE EXTRACTS*

The Secret Doctrine teaches the progressive development of everything, worlds as well as atoms; and this stupendous development has neither conceivable beginning nor imaginable end. Our "Universe" is only one of an infinite number of Universes, all of them "Sons of Necessity," because links in the great Cosmic chain of Universes, each one standing in the relation of an effect as regards its predecessor, and being a cause as regards its successor.

* From the Original Edition, Vol. I, p. 43; see Vol. I, p. 74, Third Edition.

AROUND THE TABLE

THE day had been useful and busy, and therefore a happy one for all the members of the Family. At supper the talk had been gay, as one and another had served some morsel from the platter of his experiences. At last, though, Student heaved a sigh:

"Ah me, where has my vacation gone. By the calendar I have been home nine heavenly days. I feel something of what Easter really means—a veritable Resurrection in coming back to those I love. And to think that tomorrow I must go, go, go away to 'the other side of the world'."

The little grimace with which she accompanied the soft accentuation of the closing words, did not hide from Mother the swift comprehension which the heart gives.

"But, Student, think that we will be with you; you are our pioneer living there for all of us. We will still be togeth——."

"If you think so," interrupted Doctor, who is sometimes in such a hurry to prescribe that he takes his diagnosis for granted. "Concentrate on the home circle; it's a sure panacea for the mild psychological disturbance induced by loneliness in the midst of a college career."

"Even Devachan isn't far away you know", supplemented Spinster with an affectionate smile.

"Oh", brightened Student, "that reminds me. I hadn't spoken to the Family of my little visit the other afternoon with Aunt Sue. She says she just *knows* her husband is with her. She can *hear* him and *see* him. And Aunt Sue is no spiritualist, is she, Mentor, even if she isn't a learned book Theosophist?"

"No, she is not. She has brought forward from a previous life that extension of sight and hearing which we all possess internally. And it is not a 'gift'; it was acquired. For it comes from a soul bond made in other lives with the soul whose nearness she feels; and not necessarily when in the same physical relation as in this life, although that could very well be, too.

"All of us are primarily spiritual beings. The earth is not our origin, nor our permanent abiding place. We are born into bodies, live, form our relations as physical, psychic and spiritual beings, and return again to our more real and abiding states. Our 'home' is neither here, nor at school, and the deep solacing strength of Aunt Sue's feeling ought to be still stronger among the living, regardless of physical proximity or the absence of it. For the enduring bond between souls is that of unselfish love, the strongest power in the world."

"Mother is nearer the soul of things than all the books—and that's a fact." It was Doctor again, and as usual the current of his thought rushed him into speech.

"What a physician she would have made. Now, I can read these things and believe in them, but I so seldom really feel anything. And yet I know that if we are thinking of those we love, without thinking where they are, why, then, they're here. But does Aunt Sue really see and hear Uncle Fred?"

"Yes, and no. Any form of existence—waking, dreaming, sleeping or in devachan—is but one phase of our conscious immortal life. When we sleep, whether our consciousness is in the dream state or in inner and deeper ones, our real (subjective) relations with others continue.

"Uncle Fred carried with him whatever he felt or loved. As he, as well as those he had left in bodies, have the same interior states and forms, what he feels is felt by Aunt Sue, and carries the impress of Uncle Fred so as to be recognized."

"But, Mentor, she does not actually *know* that it is from him? The books say the dead in Devachan cannot communicate with the living." And Doctor looked as if he had detected a "heresy" in Mentor.

"The separation is not with the dead, but with the living. The dead *live* in their thoughts of their loved ones and the living seldom do that. But the living can go to the dead, if they will—if their love is deep enough, tranquil enough. Aunt Sue's feeling of nearness, her sense of receiving words, admonitions or encouragement is due to the inner relation and her love for her husband. He is not physically near, nor is he aware of her daily earthly experiences, but his love ever operates as a protection as well as a help to her. They are connected in their inner and higher natures, and in *them* we see, feel and understand, and as in Aunt Sue's case, translate that connection into terms of everyday life."

Mentor fell silent, his glance resting on Mother, whose fingers were laced with those of her youngest. After a pause Spinster rose, saying, "Mentor, I feel your chair is calling you."

Upon the word, the family slowly drifted into the living room. There the welcoming chairs and the vesper glow seemed to have been holding friendly converse of their own, in the fashion of familiar inanimate things. The speaking silence held them all for a time.

"I think," mused Student so softly that it seemed in the congenial transparent dusk of the unlit room merely that the silence had become audible. "I think that our Theosophy is too much a religion with us. It isn't our life. It's an afterthought. We are so engrossed with what we are doing that our thoughts are just shadows of our actions. It ought to be the other way around. Seems to me I just revert to Theosophy at intervals, like—like spiritual mealtimes; just put on my theosophical dress now and then.

"I know I have used a double metaphor," she added hastily, as Doctor moved uneasily, "and I didn't know I was speaking aloud—hardly. But Aunt Sue thinks she knows about Uncle Fred's 'busy life over there.'"

Mentor covered her retreat, as usual.

"Well, Student, we are all of us guilty of worse than double metaphors in our thinking. Our outward speech is usually a good deal more consistent than our mental operations. How can we take a spiritual view of things when we persist in viewing spiritual and psychic action from the basis of our waking life? What Auntie Sue takes to be recitals of his busy life over there is in that way. They are not actual actions, in our sense, for he is in a subjective state and is not in contact with other beings except in a subjective way. That is, he is thinking of them in various ways and relations. Aunt Sue perceives the subjects of his thought and feeling, and in the brain this is colored by the waking ideas, and *appears* to her as she says. But the fact is there. Just now you were 'thinking out loud' without yourself being aware of the fact, as you say. The two things are not dissimilar in nature.

"What Aunt Sue feels and only partly interprets exactly, might be known and experienced more accurately and more fully by attentive Theosophists, where this soul bond exists among the living. For we who are living, live at one and the same time in the three worlds, and might, if we would, be fully conscious of them all. We have the power to build the bridge that overpasses space and time, and might realize that there is no separateness at all, and that communion of soul does not depend on bodily presence. Rather, the roar of the senses and the waking brain mind are what prevent full communion even when we are physically near to those we love."

Student asked, perhaps a little defensively, "For a family that has been Theosophist so long we don't seem to have made much 'progress,' do we, Mentor?"

Before Mentor could reply, Doctor burst out.

"That is just what I meant a little while ago. It seems as if we all ought to be together, no matter where we are. That is what I try so hard to realize—and the others too, I fancy; but we don't seem to succeed."

"Perhaps," said Mentor, "we try too hard; or rather, spend our efforts too spasmodically. Persistent effort is what counts practically. Realization comes from *dwelling* on the thing to be realized. It is a matter of growth, not striving. It is not a problem. It is a life. Our trouble is that we are not able to draw at will, or unmixed, upon our inner store. Perhaps unconsciously to ourselves we take the attitude that we are to gain knowledge that we have not or that does not exist. Yet we say that all knowledge exists and that it is part and parcel of our inner, divine nature. If, instead of seeking it as an addition to the knowledge which our brain registers, we were to seek to change the character of our brain registration, we might have a better success from our efforts. If we are ever to come in contact with the knowledge which was ours in former births, as the *Gita* puts it, we have to make Theosophy a living power in our lives. It is because of the discordant and opposed nature of our daily thinking that we are shut out from our own

higher nature. If our real existence is in thought, then the character of our mental action either opens or keeps the doors closed."

"Oh," said Mother. "That is what is implied in Mr. Judge's saying, 'if you think so.' If our thinking were theosophical in fact we would be all the time guiding our thoughts from the basis of continuing existence. If we did that, Theosophy would 'come natural' to us. I can see how our unnoticed preconceptions and preoccupations hide from us much of the meanings even in the clearest statements of the teachers."

"You aren't the only guilty party, Mother." Doctor once more, who is always ready to confess his sins when he has company.

"That is just it. Theosophy will never 'come natural' to us as long as we think of it as something else, as something injected from outside. Nor as long as our habitual thinking is from another basis altogether. Why, when Theosophy colors our every thought and feeling—no matter what about—not till then will what the books say become our experience. For then we will be thinking as they think, feeling as they feel who wrote for us, and working as they worked who worked for us. Yes, I think so."

Spinster smiled.

"Well, if you think so, Doctor, and we all think so, we can all be around the table and part of an inseparable company whose companionship is not subject to the whim of circumstance—a truly Theosophical company."

Mentor gave his goodnight glance around the circle and then went up to his room to work. Doctor ruminated a few minutes and then—

"How empty and vacant the room seems with good old Mentor absent."

"*If you think so,*" said Student demurely.

FROM ISIS UNVEILED*

A man's idea of God, is that image of blinding light that he sees reflected in the concave mirror of his own soul, and yet this is not, in very truth, God, but only His reflection. His glory is there, but, it is the light of his own Spirit that the man sees, and it is all he can bear to look upon. *The clearer the mirror, the brighter will be the divine image.* But the external world cannot be witnessed in it at the same moment. In the ecstatic Yogin, in the illuminated Seer, the spirit will shine like the noon-day sun; in the debased victim of earthly attraction, the radiance has disappeared, for the mirror is obscured with the stains of matter. Such men deny their God, and would willingly deprive humanity of soul at one blow.

* Original Edition, Vol. I (Before The Veil), p. xviii.

EVOLUTION AND CREATION

THESE two words represent the two great poles of Western thought and belief concerning Nature and its origin. They are the answers we accept to the questions, What are we, and Whence have we come?

Christian theology is the basis of the idea of "creation." Whatever the variations among the theologians themselves or among the sects of Christendom, the fundamental idea is that in the beginning there was a void—nothing—and that out of this void Nature with its manifold variety has arisen. As there is nothing in nature itself which supports or lends any color to the idea that something can arise out of nothing, that an effect can come about without a cause, and as man is in fact unable to conceive of an effect without a cause, this fundamental idea cannot stand alone; it compels another assumption, just as one lie requires another to sustain it. The second fundamental idea of theology is that of a power which can do what there is no evidence or analogy in nature to justify assuming can be done: God, who can produce something out of nothing. This second fundamental assumption requires a third, in the same way that the first demands the second. How *could* God create something out of nothing? The answer is, By his fiat: in the beginning God *created* the heavens and the earth out of nothing, by His will—a miracle; that is, something without counterpart; an effect without material. God; His Will to act; nothing to act upon; nevertheless a resultant "heavens and the earth."

These three fundamental propositions of "revealed religion" necessarily deny in their acceptance the idea of immutable Law and as a corollary unvarying Justice. Nature has not come about under law but under the Will of God; Justice is not the reaping of what *we* sow, but what God Wills, and God may be placated or angered with a resultant mercy or vengeance.

These ideas are inherently unreasonable and opposed to experience and analogy. Their justification or explanation are nowhere to be found in Nature. They rest upon a dictum, and that dictum is the Holy Bible. Who accepts them does so in violation of experience and reason, the lessons drawn from experience. They can fill the mind in the same way that the stomach can be filled with clay, so that the sense of emptiness, of "void", is removed. They can be acted upon in the same way that any lie can be acted upon by one who accepts it for the truth. Who acts upon a false idea as to the facts of nature goes further and further astray. Who puts that which is in fact not food into his stomach grows daily weaker and more diseased. The theologian and the Christian sectarian believer are constantly under the compulsion of denying Nature or denying God because there is no reconciliation in reason or experience between the facts of the one and belief in the other.

Western Materialism, which is the opposite of Western Theology, is the basis of the idea of "evolution." There are many minor variations and modifications among scientists and their followers

concerning evolution, just as there are among theologians and sectarians regarding creation, but the fundamental idea is the same with all of them.

Materialism assumes the eternality of "Matter" exactly as theology assumes the eternality of "God." Neither can do without a self-existent and enduring Foundation from which, and in which, all Nature arises. Theology finds this foundation through faith in a Book of Revelation of God. Materialism finds this foundation through study of the Book of Nature, the facts of experience. The guide of theology is "faith." The guide of materialism is "reason." The materialist takes reason for his major premise and faith in its workings for his minor. The theologian takes faith for his major premise and reason for his minor one. What they both fail to perceive, or perceive the significance of, is that reason and faith are *powers in themselves,* and that according as these powers are employed by them, so does the Eternal Foundation appear. Since reason and faith are never in harmony in them, God and Nature are never in harmony to them, but appear always at war, with alternating victories and defeats, the triumph of the one involving the subjugation of the other.

Granted the eternality of matter science, like theology, having assumed an origin for Nature finds itself compelled to fill the second "void" and tell us what we are. Instead of creation we are an evolution, and we have become what we are under Law and not under the Will of God. But this "law" is like the "will of god"—it is something outside ourselves, something with which we have nothing to do in a causal or operative sense, but of which we only experience the effects. What to theology is a miracle is to materialism chance, accident, "a fortuitous concurrence of atoms." For just as theology requires Souls to account for differentiation, so materialism requires Atoms. From God comes the stream of souls; from Matter comes the stream of Atoms. In the materialistic idea of law there is no more Justice than in the theological idea of the Will of God; instead of mercy and vengeance there is good and bad "luck."

Materialism, like theology, recognizes both good and evil with which man has some sort of a causal relation. Both see that there are some results which accrue to each being from his own actions. "Miracle" and "chance" exist because of "god" and "law," but within the assumed circle of their reign men and other beings may and do act as "god" and "law" on their own account; that is, act according to their own will; sow and reap what they sow, but subject at any moment to the over-ruling power of the Will of God or Blind Law as the case may be. So there is an interminable wrestling by each individual exponent or follower of the two systems with the problem of "predestination and free-will" or "fate and choice."

One calls these inscrutable contradictions a "mystery" and the other calls them the "missing links" of evolution. Faith does not satisfy reason nor reason faith, and neither frees the man who employs them from the contradictions in himself and in nature.

It is not difficult for the theosophical student to see that the fundamental ideas of both theology and materialism relate to the same things, nor that these ideas are actually the same, the differences being those of names and forms and not of substance. Both sets of ideas are man's attempt to solve the "riddle of life", to understand the relation of the Present and the Past and Future, of Time with Eternity, of Cause with Effect, of the Permanent with the Mortal, of the Change-full with the changeless. The theologian names his attempt God, His Will and Creation; the materialist names his attempt Matter, Law and Evolution. One depends upon Revelation and the other on Speculative Hypotheses, and, since Nature depends upon neither but continually upsets the faith of the one and the reason of the other with her inexplicable moods and tenses, both the materialist and the theologian are as continually falling into fresh "voids" which ought not to exist but which nevertheless do.

The Theosophist knows that the Three Great Truths* do in fact account for everything that is, for their origin, for the process by which they have become what they now are, and for the future becoming. In the light of these great truths he sees that the ideas of the religionists and the students of nature are but partial perceptions of the fundamental facts of all Life, of all Action and of all Being. He therefore sees, not contradictions, but partial perceptions in such words as creation and evolution, miracle and chance, "God" and "Law." He knows that Nature and himself exist by virtue of an Absolute Unity and a Relative Perception of that Unity, and that there is no separateness at all between subject, object and action; between God and Nature; between God and Himself; between Himself and all other Selves.

Theosophy is literally the reconciliation between man and nature, between theology and materialism, between faith and reason. This is so because it leaves out no department of nature, visible or invisible, and is therefore a statement of law and of fact, a knowledge of all the constituents of Nature and of Man, making of it at once a religious science and a scientific religion. It is not a formula resting upon claims of divine revelation, nor a theory invented by man. Its fundamental principles are self-evident, matters of direct perception by each individual. Its applications are all-inclusive and self-proving. It does not require to be explained. It is explanatory of all things and is therefore complete in itself and sees no unsolvable mystery anywhere.

Theosophy proceeds on diametrically opposite lines to those which are trodden by the Church; and Theosophy rejects the methods of Science, since her inductive methods can only lead to crass materialism. Yet, *de facto*, Theosophy is both religion and science, for Theosophy is the essence of both. It is for the sake and love of the two divine abstractions, *i. e.*, theosophical religion and science that the theosophical student has to become the voluntary *scavenger* of both orthodox religion and modern science; as also the relentless

* The Three Fundamental Propositions of the Secret Doctrine.

Nemesis of those who have degraded the two noble truths for their own ends and purposes, and then divorced each violently from the other, though the two are and *must be one.*

The modern Materialist insists on an impassable chasm between the two, pointing out that the "Conflict between Religion and Science" has ended in the triumph of the one and the defeat of the other. The Theosophist refuses to see, on the contrary, any such chasm at all. If it is claimed by both Church and Science that each one of them pursues the truth and *nothing but the truth,* then either one of them is mistaken, and accepts falsehood for truth, or both. Any other impediment to their reconciliation must be set down as purely *fictitious.* Truth is one, even if sought for or pursued at two different ends. Therefore, Theosophy claims to reconcile the two foes. It premises by saying that the *true* spiritual and primitive Christian religion is, as much as the other great and still older philosophies that preceded it—*the light of Truth*—"the life and the light of men."

But so is the *true* light of Science. Therefore, darkened as the former is now by dogmas examined through glasses smoked with the superstitions artificially produced by the Churches, this light can hardly penetrate and meet its sister ray in a science, equally as cobwebbed by paradoxes and the materialistic sophistries of the age. The teachings of the two are incompatible, and cannot agree so long as both religious philosophy and the science of physical and external (in philosophy, *false*) nature, insist upon the infallibility of their respective "will-o'-the-wisps." The two lights, having their beams of equal length in the matter of false deductions, can but extinguish each other and produce still worse darkness. Yet, they can be reconciled on the condition that both shall clean their houses, one from the human dross of the ages, the other from the hideous excrescence of modern materialism and atheism. And as both decline, the most meritorious and best thing to do is precisely what Theosophy alone can and *will* do: *i. e.,* point out to the innocents caught by the glue of the two waylayers—verily two dragons of old, the one devouring the intellects, the other the souls of men—that their supposed chasm is but an optical delusion.

Thus, if Theosophy does no more than point out and seriously draw the attention of the world to the fact that the *supposed* disagreement between religion and science is conditioned, on the one hand by the intelligent materialists rightly kicking against absurd human dogmas, and on the other by blind fanatics and interested churchmen who, instead of defending the souls of mankind, fight simply tooth and nail for their personal bread and butter and authority—why, even then, Theosophy will prove itself the saviour of mankind.

"Creation" and "Evolution" will then appear, not as shibboleths or fetishes, but the corrupted and erroneous perceptions of Karma, the Law of all Life, and Reincarnation, its process of Becoming.

ON THE LOOKOUT

The *Lookout* always considers with interest anything said by Professor Frederick Soddy, not because of his scientific attainments, though these are great, nor yet because of his power of correct reasoning from the facts premised, but because of a certain catholicity of courage which does not shrink from conclusions, however disastrous to scientific prepossessions. Writing recently in London *Nature* Professor Soddy draws distinctly iconoclastic conclusions on some scientific dogmas ordinarily reverenced as axioms. Going from the atom, once thought to be "irresolvable," but now known to be a complex structure, to the chemical "elements," Professor Soddy reasons from his studies of radio-active changes that the elements are by no means "unchanging." He denies their right to be considered homogeneous substances. The old criteria are considered and experimental facts adduced showing the upsetting of the "definitions" of the various elements. Students of the *Secret Doctrine* are familiar with the Occult theories of the seven great planes or states of substance, each with its seven correspondential subdivisions, but few of these students take the trouble to follow the researches of modern chemists. We wish they did, for they might see the slow but steady approach of science toward the occult divisions. Whether it is called atom or ion, or protyle or element, the fact is that science is not yet near the border-line of "irresolvable matter." The homogeneous matter of this earth, "indiscrete substance" when looked at from below upwards, is itself but one of seven basic elements or states of *Akasa —true* primordial matter or Spirit-Substance. The states above basic "earth" —and even the higher subdivisions of it—can only appear from our point of view as "forces". Hence the "constant motion" of the ions, or particles, or atoms, among themselves. "Chemical elements" as we know them are in reality fourth state matter of one state only—this earth. Higher than our "elements" are still three subdivisions imperceptible to us as "matter," and the radio groups belong to them. "Spontaneous transmutation"—the phrase used by Professor Soddy—is only a present-day wording for what was sought by the alchemists of the middle ages. This transformation or transmutation of elements goes on all the time, unrecognized as yet by scientific students, though dreamed of by many. Not till they recognize that *Intelligence* is behind all forms and all formations will the secret of transformation of the elements be within reach of our modern alchemists.

Here and there, again, in the *Secret Doctrine,* are hints of stellar bodies invisible or only visible negatively or under certain "astrological" conditions, yet forming part of the solar and cosmic system and acting and interacting on the visible stars. These statements once excited and occasionally still excite the derision of the layman who pins his faith on modern astronomical investigations. It is hence interesting to read in the *Astrophysical Journal* that Professor E. E. Barnard, a very well known astronomer, believes in these "dark bodies." His article reasons from photographs taken of the nebulae and the "holes in the sky" thereby disclosed that two conclusions are deducible. One that "space" itself is faintly luminous; the other that there are bodies in space ordinarily invisible, but whose presence and movements would account for the dark blotches and markings of the nebulae. Perhaps, too, we add, such bodies will account for the "temporary stars" so called, and for the stars of variable luminosity. If, as is hinted in the occult teachings, the "nebulae" are stars and worlds in process of formation in all stages from "laya" state to cometary matter, the "law of opposites" must hold good—and the "dark patches" might very well represent ancient stellar bodies or systems in the later and last stages of dissolution. Modern chemistry and modern astronomy are blessed at the moment with a number of bold thinkers, whose original minds may perchance lead them to strike out with some entirely new theories. If this should occur and those theories be

along the lines laid down in the *Secret Doctrine,* we might very well see within a generation some bold astronomers studying the actions of minute particles through microscopes to verify stellar motions and observations. And *vice versa,* some of our chemists may go to observing the starry depths for light on "chemical action." For, as Occultism holds, "Every body in the solar system, great or small, follows in its processes the general laws of that system to which it belongs." When physicists, chemists, students of electrical action, astronomers, and biologists, recognize that *all* matter, organic or inorganic, and regardless of size or structure of bodies, is the phenomenal display of *intelligence,* and that all the so-called "laws" are psychological, and not physical,—then we shall have an unity of effort in modern research, based on uniform postulates, that will be truly productive of knowledge of Nature.

In February *Lookout* we had occasion to refer to Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick's article, "The Trenches and the Church at Home" in the January *Atlantic Monthly.* It is something to get the facts faced fearlessly, however we may all err as to the remedy. Dr. Fosdick's article was an honest, bold and resolute facing of the facts of the selfish and the insincere attitude of modern Christianity towards the great problems of life and duty. His remedy, naturally, is an "about face" on the part of the churches; he desires the Churches to give evidence that they have "been stabbed wide awake." In commenting we said that the Churches have always been anachronistic, seeking to rule, never to lead; always opportunist, changeable, progressive, retardative, like politicians—mere "artful dodgers." Since Mr. Fosdick's article was published an immense amount of discussion has been going on. The layman, the man in the street, the returning soldier, the press and the pulpit, have each had an abundant say as to the symptoms, the disease and the cure. There is, *nota bene,* an almost universal admission of the facts alleged by Brother Fosdick: in itself no small sign of the changing mind of the race regarding things orthodox in religion. No one is as yet bold enough to advocate throwing all sectarianism into the discard; no one, of course, wise enough to avow that the very basis of Christianity—the claim to an unique revelation—is itself sectarian, bigoted and an inherent enemy to all perception of true religion and undefiled; but many, both cleric and laymen, admit that "something must be done." That "something" is still almost altogether concerned rather with the fundamental idea of "saving the churches" than saving mankind from irreligion, cant and selfishness. The various church periodicals of the different sects, however, either set up what the lawyers call a "plea in avoidance," or castigate Mr. Fosdick for his "treason" in thus exposing a condition which should be considered by the methods of "secret diplomacy" rather than by taking the world in audience while the religious "dirty linen" is being washed. A good deal of unconscious humor is betrayed by some writers. Thus Dr. Andrew Gillies in the *Christian Advocate* thinks the trouble with the average churchmember is not so much the selfish trying to save his own soul as that he is not thinking about his own or any one else's soul any more. He says "it is far easier to raise a million for missions than it is to get a dozen strong men on their knees, crying 'God be merciful to me a sinner.'" And he fears greatly that the "churches shall become mere agents of social service" rather than evangelical institutions. It is not so very long ago that good Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., endeavored to arouse the Christian world to the idea that the business of the church is to preach and *practice* the "Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man" as the essence of all religion and got himself scourged almost as savagely as the original speaker of the phrase. If the "church" has been an unfaithful steward for centuries—as is pretty largely admitted by Christians themselves—what hopes for its reformation? Why try to put "new wine in old bottles"—to quote from Him who was crucified before? The clergy will never change or reform the churches. But let some able laymen fight for the teachings of Karma, of reincarnation,

of the One Spirit in all men and in all things, and the corner-stone for a new religion of mankind will become a possibility.

A writer in London *Times* voices a strong censure of prevailing ideas in the treatment of diseases. He says much of the medical practice of the day is based upon theories derived from the dissecting table, and the dependence upon "the facts of death to explain the facts of life." Because upon a post-mortem, certain organs are found to be affected in one way and another it does not follow that the changes noted occurred prior to death. There is no necessary or sure connection between the symptoms noted in the living and the conditions of the organs after death. He speaks hopefully of the "new medicine" as the conception that disease is a long process, possibly a life-long process with the "fibrous" changes that the dissectionists make so much of, a mere resultant of the long course,—not a cause. He sees no other difference than one of location between "corns on toes, and corns on heart valves or in kidneys and liver." During the war innumerable cases arose with all the familiar symptoms and signs of a wide variety of diseases, but without the "fibrous changes"—and the majority of the cases, despite their symptoms of "incurability" were, none the less cured. The various diseases were found to show progressive symptoms, extending from one organ or organs to others; one disease developing others in sequence. Of course the *Times* correspondent sees the cause as due to "the invasion of germs." He does not see that the logic which is accurate in one direction can also be aimed in another. He does not raise the question why "germs" affect one man in one way, and another in another, nor why still others, under identical conditions, are entirely immune to the germs. Nevertheless, his logic is sound as far as it goes. He sees that alleviative treatment for "corns" to get rid of them as effects is proper, but that the cure is in getting boots to fit. And so with other diseases—alleviation for the prevalent disease, but an adjustment of the mode of life as the true cure. Strange that doctors and observers do not see most diseases are mere by-products and symptoms of a very few basic derangements, and these latter curable only by karmic readjustment, *i. e.,* the setting up of healthful as opposed to the unhealthful practices which produced the trouble. Such practices must go deeper than any merely physical change in the mode of life; they must begin with the moral and mental nature, which are interwoven and interblended at every point with the physical. The medical profession should not leave to the quack and the charlatan, nor the empiric, the psychology of disease, which is the true field of causation.

A paper by Dr. Geo. O. Squier, recently published by the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, is devoted to a consideration of the "ultimate constituent of all matter." It is curious how the scientific mind revolves in an orbit as fixed and as much a "vicious circle" as the very subjects it studies. The search for the "Absolute" is as old as mankind, and each generation of man sees the focal point of its vision as the "ultimate constituent" of all things. This is true religiously and philosophically as well as scientifically. Yet it ought readily to be grasped that the "ultimate" of anything depends upon the point of view, which again depends upon the intelligent instrumentation of the spectator, who is, himself, the real ultimate—never the object perceived. Once, in popular phrase, "earth, water, fire, and air" were esteemed the ultimates of matter. Then our moderns began to find out as they pushed their vision further that these (with the exception of "fire") were mere compounds, resolvable into "elements" which now number nearly a hundred. Then the elements were seen to be resolvable into molecules; finally, with the growth of intelligence, molecules were found to be composed of atoms, and the end was thought to have been reached; the word "atom" means uncut, that is, indivisible. Within the generation, however, the "indivisible atom" has been broken up, and lo, we have ions and electrons as the constituents of the atom. The fertile Greek

is once more pressed into graphic usance, for "ion" means a traveler. They are variously described as "particles of motion" and as "charges of electricity." At all events the modern student has reduced "matter" to a state of non-matter, and actually to "force," *i. e.*, the "fire" state of the *Bhagavad-Gita* as well as of the Rosicrucians. So far, so good. It preludes a new scientific formulation, already beginning vaguely to be defined, that "force" is to matter as a cause to an effect, and another step on the ladder of experimental knowledge will be taken as knowledge itself. Dr. Squiers uses one portentous phrase: "The master physicists have built up for us an alluring conception of miniature solar systems of which all gross matter is composed." The conception of matter, or force, or matter and force, as the basis of the manifested universe is singularly illogical, as can be very tritely shown. It is the attempt to explain a three-dimensional universe in terms of two factors. What is the third? Occultism answers, *Mind,* the conscious intelligence or spirit behind all phenomena. The third factor is the student himself. What every branch and department of experimental science needs and must have as an all-inclusive hypothesis is nothing less than the "three fundamental propositions" of the *Secret Doctrine.* Then will science become truly scientific and religious and philosophical as well, and the "ultimate" road to a knowledge of nature's mysteries entered upon.

Havelock Ellis, a student of men and things with a great repute in England as a scientific philosopher, and who has written much on the great war and its lessons, has a curious article in London *Nation* on the way to end wars. To our mind it presents a vivid illustration of weighing the facts with the thumb of one's preconceptions in the scale. We quote:

> "We may put aside the fantasies of those who once imagined that the supreme power of love . . . would one day swallow up war. . . . Love is the obverse . . . of which hatred is the reverse. . . . Abolish love and hate would disappear. Nor is there any more reliance to be placed on reason than on love. That reason is but a tool in the hands of the passions has since Spinoza been a truism. War is bound up with the passions, and can only be treated like the passions. Letourneau compared it to cannibalism . . . which has disappeared not through love or through reason . . . but through a process of sublimation . . . which among ourselves left only its final transformation in the most spiritual sacrament of the Christian Church."

This is good enough—or bad enough—to stand without comment. Mr. Ellis is good enough to give the causes of war as he sees them, to-wit, an "excessive birth rate" and "excessive industrialism." His consequent reasoning is as beautiful as his disregard for the contradictory facts. He concludes:

> "We can see the line along which war must eventually disappear, even without any active human interference. Its two causes are already decaying. The excessive birth-rate is falling, and necessarily falls with every rise in culture. Excessive industrialism has likewise passed its climax; there is no more world left to fight for; and with the regularization of industrial and commercial activities, of the whole material side of life, the economic cause of war falls away, and the energy thus released is free for sublimation into other and possibly more exalted forms of human activity."

If Mr. Ellis's "sublimation" of activities as exemplified in his article, which sees love as a passion; hate as something to be abolished by abolishing love; reason as "but a tool in the hands of the passions;" and the cause of war in the birth-rate and the "industrialism" which abets it—if this is his "possibly more exalted form of human activity," then for any sake let us have wars and more wars. We had not hitherto supposed it possible for an equivalent measure of distortion of fact and perversion of reason to over-

ride the mental processes of a madman. Perhaps a truer cause for war lies in just such psychology and philosophy as Mr. Ellis so ably displays.

Sympathizers with the aboriginal red man have long bewailed the stealing by the white man of his hunting grounds, in exchange for the white man's rum, diseases and immoralities. Few of these mildly altruistic persons have, however, done other than rejoice that many of the Indians have also accepted the white man's religion. It has seemed to them that this opportunity to save his soul has more than atoned for the destruction of our red brother's bodily welfare. It now appears as possible that out of the primitive mind may come a religious regeneration for the dominating Christian. Listen to these words of Chief Red Fox Skiuhushu of the Northern Blackfeet, taken from the *New-Church Messenger:*

> "The edict of our modern life is that no man has a right to be free. We are all slaves to one another, from the millionaire to the day-laborer. It is, indeed, astonishing that man should deliberately perpetuate the slavery of his race by failing to recognize that he is born into earth-life for the purpose of spiritual development, not that he might conform to human schemes and invention of materialistic tendencies. This was Jesus's teaching. . . . . Man has deliberately ignored the basic principle of nature's economy—the right to live. This civilization of exclusiveness, for which might have been substituted right and justice, which permits one man to live while his neighbor starves, makes entirely for material development, not spiritual development. . . . . Our true development does not come by way of the present so-called civilization. On the contrary our civilization is one of strife and antagonism and exclusiveness which benefits the few to the detriment of the human race; for when individuals deny one another the right to exist on earth, what can we expect of nations?"

He opposes this picture with his conception of true existence in the following:

> "A country where the simple material necessities of life are within the reach of all and men may devote the greater part of their days to the development of their minds and bodies, making of them the sacred shrines and temples which the Supreme Being intended them to be, and not bodies of lust. This is no idle fancy, no commercial dream; it is the actual and normal earthly condition which nature intended man should inherit, through the process of his evolutionary development on earth."

Chief Red Fox is, we judge, a Swedenborgian by education, but there is more grasp of the real nature of man and his "evolutionary purpose" in the heart and mind of this Indian than in all the dogmas of all the sects, all the progress of modern science, and all our theories of government. For his are truly theosophical ideas, innate in a noble nature, and not the result of anything learned in the schools of the superior race.

In *School and Society* Professor Carl Holliday of the University of Montana writes of the signs of a revulsion of feeling against the endless specializations and laborious classifications of fact and phenomena which he considers to be a spell cast by Teutonic methods. He calls it all "specialized ignorance," and says that the average professor uses a technical lingo wholly beyond the public ken, but adds, "fortunately the affair is becoming so bad that not even the professors can understand one another." And he quotes a writer in *Science* recommending the abandonment of the publications of the *Proceedings.* Professor Holliday asks:

> "Would it not be far better if our investigators in science or literature could come together and compare the larger, more all-embracing facts they have discovered and thus attempt to evolve some of the more general and important principles underlying all life or all literature. But too often these grubbers for minutiae are too busy collecting small data to spare time for such a helpful comparison and beneficial endeavor. . . .

What we need in our universities to-day is more men who are familiar with several correlated fields. . . . . Above all, perhaps, the American university needs a professor of comparative knowledge or of things in general who can rescue the students from the bewildering coils of the frenzied specialists . . . . and bring them where they can look about and consider things in their just relationships."

From *Current Opinion* we get a review of a curious study by Professor Harlow Shapley on telling evolutionary time by a study of star colors. The colors of the stars and the brilliancy and steadiness of their light may, it is speculated, be made a basis for calculating the life of any given planet and the various evolutionary stages of the different bodies making up the cosmos as known to us. Once more the roving scientific imagination approaches the outer confines of occultism. Even to imagine a relation between color and time, between light and "evolutionary progress," between spectral analysis and "growth," may one day lead to the consideration that the "characteristics of matter" are actually indices of states of consciousness and degrees of intelligence, the objective phases of an internal life.

The students and initiates of the Wisdom-Religion have been preaching for ages to the deaf ears of the multitude that "time" is meaningless apart from the consciousness which notes the succession of events; that "evolution" apart from the consideration of the life dwelling in all forms is but a shadow; that light, heat, electricity, and all other forms of "energy" are nothing if not the phenomenal display of consciousness in action, and, finally, that "matter" itself is equally a pure illusion when looked upon as an "independent reality." So speculations like those of Professor Shapley, inconsequential and leading nowhere in themselves, are none the less significant as the "phenomena of consciousness" in the scientifically minded, and therefore as indicative of coming events as the appearance of a comet, the revolution of the stellar universe, the colors he is studying. They are the first faint, dim crepuscular radiation of what are now but nebulous questionings, later on, we hope, to fall into the orbital motion of distinct study of the Secret Doctrine.

Quite in the same trend is the *Memorial of Sir William Ramsay, His Life and Work,* by Sir William A. Tilden. Sir William Ramsay, one of the best known of modern physicists, spent many years in his efforts to solve the mysteries of the "elements" as we call those chemical combinations which have hitherto resisted all attempts to break up their formations. He was convinced that "transmutation" is possible because convinced that our so-called elements are not so in fact. Radium and its possibilities and behavior, while not yet understood, none the less clearly indicate that the alchemists were right in theory, however they erred in practice or failed to achieve "results" in the modern acceptation of that word. Professor Crookes, as is well known, holds views along similar lines, and in fact many scientific students are convinced of the soundness of Ramsay's inferences. Yet they might all as well attempt to substitute chemical formula and fine and delicate instruments for the brains they use, as to study matter and its phenomena without recognizing that the phenomena of matter are as much phenomena of consciousness as their own studies and speculations. They act on matter because they are conscious, not because they have bodies. They must come to see that matter acts on us, not because it is matter, but because it is conscious, and that even the "elements" are as susceptible to "change" as we ourselves in our own modes and processes. He who attempted to deal with a man or a plant as a "body" devoid of consciousness would find plenty of insoluble enigmas. Matter reacts to impressions as promptly as we do, and for the same reason: Intelligence. Once study matter as intelligent and the doors are open to real progress in the understanding of nature in all her infinite form and variety.